INTRODUCTION

Heritage can be described as a process of determining what we wish to pass on to future generations. This project aims to contribute to the debate about what New Zealand and its Antarctic community values as heritage. To date, the Antarctic community has been willing to recognise and protect its heritage, though it has been somewhat selective in doing so. The TAE Hut points to a key period in New Zealand's Antarctic history and is rapidly becoming part of our heritage. What is the best future for the TAE Hut?

This project examines future options for the TAE Hut. What are the debates around the TAE Hut – what values are important? What precedents are there for managing and preserving this historic building and in what ways are they applicable? What are the options for the future and the debates that should be had?
A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE TAE HUT

The TAE hut has been retained as a significant part of the original Scott Base buildings. It was originally known as A Hut or the mess hut, and housed the mess, kitchen, radio room and Leader's office.

The first buildings at Scott Base were erected in early 1957, in preparation for the International Geophysical Year (IGY) and the Commonwealth Trans-Antarctic Expedition (TAE). Frank Ponder, Government Architect of the Ministry of Works and Development, had designed the base in New Zealand. Originally envisaged to service just the IGY and TAE projects, parts remained in use for 25 years, as part of New Zealand's continued presence in the Antarctic. (Harrowfield, 1997)

A Hut was one of six separate huts connected by a covered way. Each of these huts was prefabricated in New Zealand, allowing them to be built rapidly on site. A timber foundation was laid on the ground, and the whole hut tied down with guy wires and anchor rods. Four of the huts were constructed using Aluminium sandwich panels, while the other two were a heavier plywood construction. They joined to the covered way by a cold porch, which apart from providing some insulation also housed the fuel and heating unit for the hut. (Harrowfield, 1997)

As the mess, and therefore, key social space of Scott Base, A Hut hosted many of the key events in New Zealand Antarctic history. In the early days, it was there that New Zealanders had their first midwinter dinner and received Sir Vivian Fuchs and his party on arrival from the other side of Antarctica. It has hosted dignitaries from governors-general, Prime Ministers, royalty, explorers, scientists to film crews. Many of today's experienced Antarctic scientists remember meals and social events there. It was used as the mess until its replacement in the 1981-82 season by the new mess, bar and lounge building. (Harrowfield, 1997)
As Scott Base was gradually re-built, changes were made to A Hut and the other buildings. The colour now associated strongly with New Zealand Antarctic buildings, RBT green, was not used until 1965-66. Previously, the buildings had been orange, or cream and orange. Extension, expansion and re-furbishment of the base began in 1962-63, and a major rebuilding project was initiated in the early 1970s, and continued right through the 1980s. Virtually all of the rebuilding was concurrent with demolition and removal of the old buildings that were being replaced. (Harrowfield, 1997)

Once the new kitchen, dining and bar building was in use, A Hut remained in use for additional sleeping space in the summer season. (Harrowfield, 1998) This use continued until 1989. Although it had been announced by the Prime Minister in 1982 that A Hut would be removed and taken to Ferrymead Historic Park in Christchurch (NZAR, 1982), by the mid 1980s it was scheduled to be demolished in 1990/91. However, at the same time a few keen individuals including John Claydon and Garth Varcoe were working towards its retention as a museum and recreation space. (Harrowfield, 1998)

After a campaign to ensure that it was kept, in the 1989-90 season, A Hut, the last remaining part of the original Scott Base was re-sited down the hill out of the way of the main base buildings, to give room for new developments. The move involved unfreezing and blasting the original foundations and winching the hut into its new position. (Harrowfield, 1998)

In 1992 a helicopter accident took the life of Garth Varcoe who had been so instrumental in the preservation of the TAE Hut. Donations given at his funeral, together with the TAA money helped to create a fund run by the TAE Hut Committee, who had their first meeting later that year. The TAE Hut Committee has provided the direction and impetus for much of the work that has gone on since, such as reinstating walls, and repainting.
The following table highlights the key events in the life of A Hut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1957</td>
<td>Built</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>RBT green colour scheme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>Despite a warning from Ponder [the original architect] that the building might collapse, large double-glazed windows with strengthened frames were installed in the mess hut.&quot; (Harrowfield, Scott Base, p22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>By this time the mess was cramped and base recreation facilities were non-existent (Harrowfield, 1997)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>A severe storm hits, blowing in the floor of A Hut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1982</td>
<td>Stage 3B of rebuilding (New mess) completed and opened as a shell (25\textsuperscript{th} Anniversary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1989</td>
<td>TAE hut re-sited by Garth Varcoe and team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>Cold-porch constructed, hut re-painted, partitioned, re-wired, and heating installed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(summer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Interior painted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(winter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Trans Antarctic Association donation for restoration and upkeep of the TAE Hut (Harrowfield, 1998)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Garth Varcoe begins contacting TAE members for photos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Death of Garth Varcoe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1992</td>
<td>First meeting of TAE Hut committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpeting, vinyl laid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1997</td>
<td>Extension of cold porch incorporating a section of the original covered way. (Harrowfield, 1998)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE TAE HUT TODAY

A visit to the TAE Hut today shows its structure much the same as it was when it was built. The reinstated internal walls mean its internal configuration of kitchen, mess room, radio room and leader's office, is pretty much how it was. An entry has been re-created, though from a different angle. One still enters through a cold porch, the old corrugated iron covered way, past the heating unit, and through the "fridge" door. The mess room, radio room and office are now carpeted, but all the work has not managed to rid the hut of the fuel smell, which seems to be impregnated into the essence of the building. The portraits of the Queen and Prince Phillip still hang on the wall, as does the Marcus King landscape.

The hut is now a repository for memorabilia from different stages of New Zealand Antarctic work. The entry passage has the letterbox and sign from Vanda Station. The mess has IGY chief Trevor Hatherton's boots, and a mannequin dressed in ECWs worn on the TAE, while on the bookshelf, logs and collections of memories from Scott Base, Hallett Station and Vanda sit waiting to be glanced through. The radio room has large display boards full of captioned photos, and a collection of the old radios. The leader's office has a cabinet full of maps and plans, many with tantalising blank spaces, waiting to be filled in, and more display boards. There are some vinyl chairs around the table, and a few relaxing chairs also sit in the mess. The kitchen looks pretty sparse and unused – there is nothing on the bench or in the cupboards. There is a book for visitors to sign on the Formica table, much like in the heroic era huts.

Visitors to the TAE Hut may also find mattresses for overflow sleeping, a tv, video and Playstation for people to use for relaxation, a collection of people evacuated from Scott Base during a fire drill, or just a couple of people taking some time out and looking around, reading about past exploits. On the Scott Base map, it is shown as 'TAE hut (museum)'.
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TAE Hut Management

The TAE Hut is currently managed as an integral part of Scott Base. Particularly during the winter months it provides a retreat space from the main Scott Base buildings, and a shelter during fire alarms. According to its place as a relaxation space the hut is envisaged as retaining the feeling of the old mess hut as much as its actual appearance (i.e. a homely, relaxing space). (Rogers, 1999)

Antarctica New Zealand is currently responsible for the maintenance, lighting and heating of the TAE Hut. Any further work is done partially by volunteer labour (after hours work by base staff and others) and partially under Antarctica New Zealand jurisdiction. (Rogers, 1999) The TAE Hut Committee provides overall direction of the TAE Hut and its preservation. (Harrowfield, 2000)
DEBATES AND VALUES

Introduction

Any suggestions about the future of the TAE Hut should take into account the debates surrounding, and the values placed on it. This section examines those debates as they apply to the TAE Hut. I look first at what heritage and historic may mean, and the reasons for and approaches to preserving our history. What is an authentic way to preserve our history – will it involve ‘invasive’ work to take things back to how they were, or just leaving things alone?

And what approach is most appropriate? Should it be a precious place where access is restricted and supervised and nothing may be touched, or a place that continues to be useful, functioning part of the base? Should interpretation of the history be provided, or education?

And who will use or visit the Hut – tourists, base staff, scientists, Kiwis, Americans? How might the approach be tailored to these groups?

What is heritage? What is historic?

The Oxford English Dictionary of Current English defines ‘heritage’ as ‘a nation’s historic buildings, monuments, countryside, etc., especially when regarded as worthy of preservation’.

Heritage is commonly thought of as tangible evidence of history (things such as buildings and artefacts). In discussions, spurred particularly by participation in the Antarctic heritage research project (K072), people expressed a wider understanding of Antarctic heritage. Our definition included more intangible and less specific aspects of Antarctica as heritage, such as landscape, wildlife, views and silence.

As the second part of the dictionary definition suggests, heritage must also be accepted by the community as worth saving. Sometimes only a sector of the community is willing to work towards preservation, but there is a level of general acceptance. In an Antarctic context, Nigel Watson (Executive Officer of the Antarctic Heritage Trust) suggested that modern buildings were not yet in the ‘heritage’ category, as they are not commonly accepted as heritage (Watson, 2000).
The commonly accepted definition of heritage is probably still relatively narrow, and in Antarctica, heritage is generally thought of as the tangible remains of the heroic era.

The Oxford English Dictionary of Current English defines ‘historic’ as ‘famous or important in history, or potentially so’. This definition of historic, unlike the above one of heritage, seems to fit the TAE Hut more comfortably. The Hut’s association with the exploits of the Commonwealth Trans-Antarctic Expedition, which was so widely supported by the New Zealand public, mean it is historically significant to New Zealanders. As the initial building at Scott Base, it is also a significant reminder of New Zealand presence in the Antarctic. It is likely that the TAE Hut is only seen as historic by New Zealanders or those with a close association with Scott Base, as it would not appear in any other nation’s historical narratives.

These definitions suggest that while the TAE Hut is definitely a historic building for New Zealanders, and particularly for the Antarctic community, it may not yet qualify as heritage, though it probably will do in the future. This is not necessarily an impediment to its preservation, but it does show a significant difference between the TAE Hut and the heroic era huts. It is also significant for the AHT which has been set up ‘to seek the restoration, preservation and protection of the historical heritage of human endeavour in Antarctica’ (AHT, 2000). If the TAE Hut is not yet considered heritage, then the AHT should not yet be involved, but it should be prepared for future involvement.

**Reasons for preservation**

The reasons for preserving historic buildings and artefacts relate mainly to cultural identity. Holding on to selected pieces of cultural history allows a society to remember and respect the achievements of the past and gives a context for present day endeavour. The TAE Hut is an important part of New Zealand Antarctic culture and identity. It is a tangible link that represents both the achievements of the TAE and the IGY.
The TAE has been described as a defining moment in New Zealand culture. The narrative surrounding Hillary’s decision to head for the Pole, supposedly against the orders of “Mother” England suggests New Zealand’s willingness to grow up and be independent from the mother country (Higham, 1999). The TAE also demonstrated the New Zealand cultural characteristics of adaptability and pragmatism, with the use of farm tractors, specially adapted to cross the Antarctic landscape.

The IGY, though smaller in the imagination of the New Zealand public, is a key date in New Zealand’s Antarctic history. Without it, we would not have built Scott Base, or started our scientific work. For the scientific community, the IGY is a defining historical moment – as it is for most nations involved in Antarctic work.

The TAE Hut shows where we started in Antarctica, and the way we did things. It shows where we have come from and suggests what we have learned. It is a way of remembering and respecting the work of New Zealanders who have worked in the Antarctic.

It has been suggested that the TAE Hut, or Scott Base as a whole is a kind of turangawaewae (standing place, place of identity) for pakeha New Zealanders – a place that they can use to identify our cultural origins, and feel at home, in the same way Maori may feel about a home marae. (Foster, 2000)

**Authenticity**

Historic buildings often cause people to debate the concept of authenticity. There is debate over whether it is authentic to restore things to how they were, in the process destroying the natural process of change and decay. There is debate whether authenticity is vital for historic buildings. There is debate when buildings have been moved on the site, whether this destroys something essential about the building’s history.
The TAE Hut has already undergone some maintenance and restoration work, and it has been moved from its original site. Some of these changes were to ensure its preservation, and prevent further physical deterioration.

Prior to the TAE Hut being moved to its present site, Worley Consultants' report stated that the 'existing location of “A” hut is needed for further extension to the base' and suggested it be moved down the hill away from the other base buildings. (Worley Consultants, 1990?) The old site is now used by the new Ablutions block. It should be noted that the move was a reflection of prioritising new developments over the historic placement of the Hut.

People I spoke to had mixed opinions about moving the hut from its original site. Some felt that it was a pity it had to be moved from its original context, and destroyed some of its authenticity as a historic building. (Cochran, 2000) Others felt that it had more meaning now it is able to stand apart from the newer buildings. (Bradshaw, 2000) The latter opinion is supported by the Worley Consultants report, which stated that the hut’s old position was not visually complimentary to the newer buildings because of the difference in construction and age. The view is substantially similar in the new position. (Bradshaw, 2000)

A lot of work was done on the TAE Hut in the 1989/90 season. It was moved to its new site, re-roofed, the exterior painted to match the rest of Scott Base, internal partitions re-instated and completely re-wired. The interior was re-painted during the winter (Harrowfield, 1998). These tasks represent a mixture of maintenance and heritage preservation work.

Chris Cochran pointed out that early changes to a building, such as the removal of internal partitions, could also have historic value and reinstatement of original features in not a necessary approach to preservation and presentation of historic buildings. (Cochran, 2000) Re-painting would have involved getting rid of previous paint, which may have had historic value, and its degradation have something to say about the time passing. There could be
concern over the idea that the colour of the TAE Hut ought to match the rest of Scott Base (though this may be a neighbourly gesture). The hut has also been carpeted, which was a change noted by IGY people visiting the hut for a reunion (National Radio, 2000). This has been done very recently and was facilitated by a donation of carpet. (Harrowfield, 1998)

The work done on the TAE Hut demonstrates the dual (or conflicting) purposes the hut is being used for. Actions such as the reinstatement of the internal partitions clearly demonstrate the desire to take the hut back to its IGY appearance. On the other hand, the carpeting of the hut demonstrates the desire to make the hut a comfortable retreat for today's visitors and base staff. Other work such as re-wiring and exterior re-painting may be safety and environmental measures.

How should it be used?

There are several options for use of historic buildings. They may be set aside as historic places, or museums, adapted for contemporary use and usefulness, or used as a combination.

For the TAE Hut, it is an option to set it aside as a historic place, as the heroic era huts have been. This would mean preventing any uses except viewing and conservation work. It would probably mean that it would be locked to prevent unauthorised access, and may involve measures such as limiting visitor numbers, like the historic huts. It would also mean that visitors would be encouraged not to touch any items. It is also possible that visitors would be supervised, or briefed with a Code of Conduct before entering the building. Displays would be limited to artefacts that would have been found in the building at that time period.

Another option is to make the TAE Hut into a museum, where there are displays of historic items, and some explanation of their significance. This will not necessarily preclude people being able to touch items. Unlike the historic place option, artefacts and displays would be important features. Visitors would have more of an ‘educational’ experience, with displays
and interpretative material, on various topics related to, but not specifically about living in the Hut itself.

A third option is to allow the TAE Hut to be used as an integral part of Scott Base. This may involve adapting it for contemporary needs.

At present, the TAE Hut is used as a mixture of the second and third options, though there has not been major adaption for present day use (barring re-wiring and other safety measures).

How should it be presented?

In historic places and museums, there is debate over whether buildings and artefacts should be in their natural place, without labels and interpretation presented, to give the overall impression of the place in a particular time period, or whether there should be educational material pointing out and explaining features.

This has been a debate in both the AHT and the TAE Hut Committee as to whether the extent to which labels and explanations detract from the overall atmosphere of the huts, or add to people's understanding. At present, the AHT managed huts have no interpretation material in them, though some have 'favoured 'sensitive thematic displays and interpretation' (AHT, 1995). The TAE Hut has displays and some items are labelled. There is a clear intention by the TAE Hut committee to provide explanation of items on display and important features, though it is intended they be kept unobtrusive (TAEHC, 1998). The large photo boards are evidence of this policy.

It seems that the first part of any book or paper on Antarctica gives a rendition of the exploits of the heroic era. This means that the background to the heroic era huts is well known by most people who visit them. Interpretation is a greater need in the TAE Hut (as opposed to the heroic era huts) because it (and its time period) suffers from a lack of general knowledge about its history (particularly in the younger generation). The older generation of Antarcticans
knows more about the TAE Hut because they used it as the Mess Hut and came into contact with people who were there at the start of its history. As time passes, this balance will change, and the immediate connection with the hut will be lessened, though it should increase in historical importance due to its age.

Interpretation material in the hut may take the form of labels, displays and explanatory photos, which is the current approach of the TAE Hut Committee. Alternative ideas are a tour guide or caretaker, as happened in the early days of the heroic era huts, (Harrowfield, 1995) or a brochure available to guide visitors around the hut and explain its history. It is always an option not to provide explanatory labels, which may allow people to get more a sense of the hut as a place that people used and lived in.

The relatively recent nature of the TAE Hut’s history means that people don’t recognise it as historical as easily as older buildings and artefacts. This seems to result in a lack of respect for historic items and features. To many kiwis, artefacts in the TAE Hut are similar to ones found at their family’s bach, and don’t command historical respect.

Who will visit, and what does that mean?

At present, tourist numbers at Scott Base are relatively low. This is probably due to the difficulties of access to McMurdo Sound, and the fact that tourism in the region is predominantly ship-based. Scott Base receives 200-300 tourists per season, though the visiting season is relatively short. (IAATO, 2000) The problem of access into McMurdo Sound is likely to preclude an explosion of tourist interest in the TAE Hut. (Bradshaw, 2000) Most of the visitors will be from Scott Base or McMurdo Station – scientists, base staff, and other visitors. However, if aircraft operations were to commence in the region, this balance could change dramatically.

If the TAE Hut is an integral part of Scott Base (i.e. not just a pure museum), then giving general access to the Hut for visitors may have implications for general access to the main base buildings, which could be difficult for Scott Base. Making the Hut a unique feature, and
doing something like locating the shop there (or adjacent to it), would make it a destination in itself, and perhaps relieve pressure on the day-to-day operations of Scott Base.

How will it fit at Scott Base? Strategic planning of Scott Base

The planning of Scott Base is inextricably linked with the management of the TAE Hut. The TAE Hut is part of Scott Base and falls within overall management plans for the site. The re-siting of the Hut in 1989 partially took into account the main view area designated in the plan (Worley Consultants, 1990?) which sought to retain a clear space in front of the main base buildings, for aesthetic and operational reasons. The TAE Hut was also painted green to match the rest of the base (Harrowfield, 1998).

Any future management plans for the TAE Hut will need to consider its place as part of Scott Base. Even if it is not managed in the same way as Scott Base, or even run by Antarctica New Zealand, its location on the same site, means that it will have to 'live with' the Scott Base buildings. Scott Base future planning should also take into account the TAE Hut.

The possible outsourcing of Scott Base operations to a private company, Serco, is a good example of a management decision that will need to take into account the TAE Hut. To date, some of the work on the TAE Hut has been done voluntarily by base staff (Rogers, 1999), but this may not be possible under a private contractor.

If the decision is made to return the TAE Hut to replicate its state in the IGY, then issues such as visual appearance may arise. The original Scott Base buildings had a yellow and orange colour scheme, whereas now they are RBT green. Harrowfield (1998) suggests that after it was relocated, the Hut was painted to match the rest of Scott Base.
The TAE Hut functions well at present as an ‘escape space’ away from the main base buildings, particularly during winter, though it does not appear to have been open every winter (TAEHC, 1997). If it is to continue as a museum of Kiwis in Antarctica, and become a pure museum space, then Scott Base will require alternative recreation space and overflow sleeping accommodation. (Bradshaw, 2000) The need for additional recreation space was recognised in a 1994 facilities plan for Scott Base, though it was the lowest priority. (Corsbie, 1994)

One of the questions I asked people about the TAE Hut was their vision for it in 50 years' time. This often brought up the linked question of what we are preserving of today's endeavours that will be around to show people in 50 years' time. Environmental regulations in force at present encourage buildings that are no longer in use to be demolished and removed from Antarctica. In line with this policy, New Zealand buildings at Cape Hallett and Lake Vanda have been completely removed. This is a concern for historians such as Sheridan Easdale of the AHT, who wonder whether we are erasing all record of ourselves that may be of interest in the future. (Easdale, 2000)
PLAYERS

There are several organisations that have involvement with the TAE Hut or could potentially do so. The TAE Hut Committee is the primary player, but Antarctica New Zealand is also involved. The Antarctic Heritage Trust, the New Zealand Antarctic Society and the McMurdo Historical Society could potentially become involved.

TAE Hut Committee

The TAE Hut Committee is a group of interested individuals who have organised to facilitate and advise on the TAE Hut. The committee was formed following the death of Garth Varcoe who, along with John Claydon, had been a driving force behind the preservation of the hut. Current members of the committee include David Harrowfield (historian and curator), John Claydon (TAE member), Gillian Wratt and Ron Rogers (Antarctica New Zealand), Arnold Heine (Trans Antarctic Association and member of the IGY scientific team), John Parsloe (NZ Antarctic Society), Deirdre Sheppard (former librarian, Antarctica New Zealand) and Kath Varcoe (ex officio). The committee meets once or twice a year to discuss plans for the future and the approach that should be taken. (Harrowfield, 2000)

In practice, the TAE Hut Committee is largely an advisor on policy to Antarctica New Zealand, which does most of the work on the hut. The exception to this is specialised monitoring, conservation and inventory work which has been done on site by David Harrowfield, John Claydon and Sarah Clayton during the Antarctic summer. This work has often been done in conjunction with Antarctic Heritage Trust activities. (Harrowfield, 1999)

Antarctica New Zealand

Antarctica New Zealand staff do all the day to day work on the TAE Hut. Some of this work is done voluntarily, but it is also part of general base management. The TAE Hut is an integral part of Scott Base, and maintained accordingly. (Rogers, 1999)
Antarctica New Zealand is represented on the TAE Hut Committee, ensuring that strategic decisions about Scott Base may be discussed. The TAE Hut Committee makes decisions about priorities and work to be done on the TAE Hut. Apart from specialist conservation, inventory and presentation work, this is carried out by Antarctica New Zealand staff.

**Antarctic Heritage Trust**

At present, the Antarctic Heritage Trust is not involved with the TAE Hut at all. David Harrowfield is involved in work for the AHT and on the TAE Hut, but does not represent the AHT on the TAE Hut Committee. There is a danger at present that AHT staff will have little knowledge of the TAE Hut, particularly on a formal level.

The issue of whether the TAE Hut is included in the AHT's mandate is important. As discussed above, it is likely that the Hut does not fall within their current responsibilities, but it is likely to do so in the future. Given that the Trust may have more responsibility for it in the future, it is in their best interest to contribute knowledge and expertise on preservation and heritage issues now, to prevent future regrets.

**New Zealand Antarctic Society**

The Antarctic Society does not currently have any responsibilities for historic buildings or artefacts, or the expertise to do so. However its members have considerable expertise and knowledge of Antarctic social history. Particularly if the TAE Hut remains a repository for the history of Kiwis in Antarctica, the Antarctic Society will have much to contribute. The representation of the society on the TAE Hut Committee by John Parsloe is at present an appropriate link between the society and the TAE Hut. Any future management organisations would benefit from a similar arrangement.
McMurdo Historical Society

The McMurdo Historical Society is a collection of people at McMurdo Station who are interested in the history of the modern era in Antarctica (i.e. post-heroic era). They have recently developed a website to record and present people’s Antarctic experiences and recollections, and may also be involved in the establishment of a modern history museum at McMurdo Station. (Bradshaw, 2000) They potentially have expertise in the same time period as the TAE Hut, and may in the future provide an appropriate venue for display of New Zealand Antarctic memorabilia, but this has not been confirmed.
MODELS FOR MANAGEMENT

This section describes several models of ways that heritage buildings are managed in Antarctica. It is not a complete list of ways, but significant examples are covered. The models are not all immediately transferable to the TAE Hut situation, but there are lessons to be learned from each of them. Each example shows a unique solution for a unique situation. We should therefore expect the solution for the TAE Hut to be equally unique. The proposed way ahead for the TAE Hut will be discussed in the next section.

Model 1: Discovery Hut at McMurdo Base

Discovery Hut, dating from the British Antarctic Expedition of 1902-03 is located almost on base at the US McMurdo Station. There have had to be deliberate measures taken to avoid encroachment on the site by McMurdo Station activities.

Discovery Hut is currently managed by the New Zealand Antarctic Heritage Trust (AHT). It is listed as a Historic Site within the Antarctic Treaty System (ATS). It is kept locked, and a key held by the Scott Base manager, and the McMurdo manager. Anyone who visits is briefed about the precious nature of the hut and the artefacts contained within it, and told not to touch anything to avoid damage. Under the AHT Code of Conduct, a maximum of 12 people are allowed in the hut at any one time, to avoid damage due to crowding (people bumping into things) and excess moisture (from breathing) coming into the hut. Nonetheless damage does occur, and over the years, artefacts have been taken from the hut. This is a particularly prevalent problem at this hut (as opposed to other heroic era huts at Capes Evans, Royds and Adare) because of the large numbers of visitors due to its proximity to McMurdo Station and Scott Base.

Discovery Hut receives several hundred visitors each year. (Harrowfield, 1995) These visitors include base staff from McMurdo and Scott Base, visiting scientists, researchers and dignitaries, and tourists from tour ships. Tourists pay $NZ30 to visit all the AHT managed
huts in the area, and this forms a large part of the AHT’s funding for maintenance and preservation. (Easdale, 2000) Other visitors to the hut do not pay. The tourist levy can only ever be on a voluntary basis because AHT do not actually own the huts, and it is unclear who does. AHT does have tacit approval for their management under the ATS, and there does not appear to be any dispute over their being locked.

There is no interpretation material in the hut, artefacts such as food tins are on shelves and stacked on the floor. In some cases, artefacts are tagged and placed on acetate to protect them from further decay, but this is generally not noticeable. Background information in the form of brochures produced by the AHT is available from the bases.

The hut is on its original site, and is located near Vince’s Cross, but the site is not protected as the hut and cross are under the ATS. The site is protected from vehicular traffic by the placement of large concrete barriers some distance away. A chain-link fence that used to encircle the hut has been removed.

Lessons to be learned:

- The preservation of historic buildings is possible close to a working base
- It is possible to prevent vehicle access nearby to prevent accidental damage and visual impact
- It is possible to prevent development of station activities in close proximity to lessen the intrusiveness of more recent developments
- The site itself does not need to have the same formal protection as the building
- A system where the building is locked, and people briefed on a Code of Conduct before entering the building ensures all visitors are informed.
Fundamental differences from the TAE Hut:

- Discovery Hut is listed in the ATS as a Historic Site (Harrowfield, 1995)
- Discovery Hut was never a part of McMurdo Station and is not on the main base site
- Historical distance, and gap of occupation. No-one at McMurdo now ever used the hut.
- It is not useful for occupation (Cochran, 2000)
- Sovereignty is unclear. The TAE Hut has the advantage of clear sovereignty – making it philosophically much easier to charge for entry, and lock it up – at least for US and other visitors, but perhaps not for New Zealanders).
- It is part of the ‘International Heritage’ of Antarctica, not a national programme (Watson, 2000).

Model 2: Port Lockroy on Goudier Island

Port Lockroy was the first British base on the Antarctic Peninsula, and was built as part of a secret wartime operation known as Operation Tabarin, in 1944. It was built in close proximity to a Gentoo penguin colony. It was used after the war for scientific work, and particularly important work was done there during the IGY, but was closed in 1962. (UKAHT, 2000)

A move by the British Antarctic Survey (BAS) to clean up or restore their abandoned bases in the 1990s led to Port Lockroy being declared a Historic Site and Monument under the ATS. In tandem with the UK Antarctic Heritage Trust (UKAHT), repair and conservation began in 1996. (UKAHT/BAS, undated) This work included the rebuilding of damaged areas (such as a roof that had fallen in), waterproofing and the removal of vast quantities of "rubbish". (Cochran, 1999)

The BAS and the UKAHT currently manage Port Lockroy. Resident caretakers live there from November to March – they host tourists, maintain the buildings, and take scientific...
observations. Their salary is covered by money made from tourists visiting the site. (Cochran, 1999)

Port Lockroy receives a large number of visitors, largely from tourist ships due to its easy accessibility on the Antarctic Peninsula. It got 6,000 visitors in its first season as a tourist destination. (Cochran, 1999)

The base is set up to be as it was when it was left – i.e. a picture of life in the late 50s and early 60s. It does not present the base as it was when it was established, nor as it was prior to renovation. It has both interpretative material and guided tours (when base staff are available). (UKAHT/BAS, undated) This may help to prevent damage and removal of artefacts.

Lessons to learn:

- There is interest in the history of the modern period of Antarctic endeavour
- There is interest in national bases.
- It is possible to provide staff who perform multiple tasks in order to maintain the base (maintenance & guiding tourists & scientific monitoring)
- It is possible to make repairs with today's materials on modern buildings, and not to be too precious about them (Cochran, 2000)

Fundamental differences from the TAF Hut:

- Port Lockroy is on a prime tourist route, easily accessible by ship and is near a penguin colony. This makes it very attractive for tourists, which means the funding available from tourist visits is substantial. This allows BAS and the UKAHT to pay for staff at the base from tourist proceeds.
- There was a gap between the last use of the buildings and its renovation and use as a historic place/tourist destination.

- Port Lockroy is free-standing, not part of any base complex.

- Port Lockroy is listed in the ATS as a Historic Site (UKAHT/BAS, undated)

**Model 3: Scott Base**

The TAE Hut is currently part of the operations of Scott Base. Some effort has been made to designate it a special space, and dedicate it to the history of Kiwis in Antarctica. It is used as a recreation space, emergency fire shelter and overflow sleeping area. It is not joined to the rest of the base, but is heated and lit, as the other buildings are, and access is available to anyone who wishes to use it at any time. It is not locked and there is no restriction on the number of people who may visit it.

It is sometimes used for special functions such as reunions, or for winter staff to have special occasions. On those occasions people may gather there and eat meals. (Rogers, 1999)

There are several display boards with historic photos on them, but they are not specifically provided as interpretative material for the hut itself. Display material is for a variety of different events, including a significant amount of material from Vanda Station (which had to be removed from the Dry Valleys), mainly in the porch area. There is also a collection of some artefacts, again, not all relating specifically to the TAE Hut.

The TAE Hut has been moved off its original site, and renovations made to reconstruct the original walls.

Some visiting scientists and Antarctica New Zealand staff are able to recall using the TAE Hut as Scott Base's mess hut, and visitors can recall its early days.
Lessons to be learned:

- The TAE Hut is still a useful and useable part of Scott Base

Model 4: Removal to Canterbury Museum or Ferrymead Historic Park or Antarctic Visitors' Centre

Canterbury Museum has on display a part of Scott Base that was demolished and removed in the re-building process.

Before the action taken by Garth Varcoe and John Claydon that culminated in the retention of the TAE Hut on site at Scott Base, it was intended that the TAE Hut be removed whole and relocated to Ferrymead Historic Park in Christchurch (REF).

In recent years, there have also been suggestions that it would be a wonderful attraction for Canterbury Museum or the Antarctic Visitors Centre. It is felt that this would be an attractive proposition that would be well visited. The link with Edmund Hillary would ensure public interest (Harrowfield, 2000).

Lessons to be learned:

- There is significant public interest in some aspects of New Zealand Antarctic history, particularly Hillary's exploits.

For any of these models to be applicable to the TAE hut, there must be a funding mechanism. The Port Lockroy model relies heavily on self-funding, through the visit of tourists. IAATO figures show that Port Lockroy has had as many as 6,400 visitors in recent years, while sites in the Ross Sea have had no more than 800 (IAATO, 2000). It is unrealistic to think that the TAE Hut will be able to gain sufficient funding to support itself by tourist contributions alone.
The fact that the TAE Hut is part of Scott Base, and in close proximity to McMurdo means that many of the visitors will be scientists, dignitaries and base staff, rather than tourists per se. An entry fee may not be so well received by this group of people. There is no precedent, so it is difficult to tell, but generally facilities are free and open on Ross Island. Despite the fact that Discovery Hut is locked to prevent casual access, there is no charge made for visitors from the bases, who may visit as often as they like.

Chris Cochran has a point when he says that keeping the TAE Hut as a usable part of Scott Base ensures its maintenance and preservation is well funded. It is less easy to justify expenditure, he suggests, when it is ‘pure history’ being preserved, without a ‘useful’ component.
CONCLUSION

Options

The feasible options for the future of the TAE Hut appear to be the following:

1) Retained as a museum of Kiwis in Antarctica, and also used as recreation space for Scott Base, and perhaps such uses as an emergency fire shelter and overflow sleeping accommodation.

This has the advantage of being easy to manage. Funding for this option is relatively easily available, for maintenance through Antarctica New Zealand and basic conservation work through the TAE Hut Committee. This option is not as favourable for the preservation aspect of the TAE Hut as artefacts and features of the hut are more likely to be damaged, and have a reasonable amount of wear and tear. There will be a less clear presentation of what the Hut is about because of the different time periods and locations represented by artefacts. This may cause the historic value of the Hut itself to be obscured.

2) Retained as a museum of Kiwis in Antarctica, but not used for recreational purposes at Scott Base.

This has the advantage of reducing wear and tear, and potential for damage to the Hut and its contents, but places the Hut in an awkward situation financially, as it would not be logistically part of Scott Base.

3) Retained as a museum of the TAE and IGY period at Scott Base, and also used as recreation space for Scott Base.

This has similar advantages to the first option, and removes the disadvantage of diluting the historic effect of the Hut.

4) Retained as a museum of the TAE and IGY period at Scott Base, but not used for recreational purposes at Scott Base.

This is the clearest position. It makes policy making simple because appropriate and inappropriate activities and artefacts are easily determined.
The Future

I would like to make a two-part proposal for the future of the TAE Hut. The first looks ahead to describe a sequence of events that I believe would best take care of the TAE Hut. The second part describes the need for policies.

Looking ahead

I would like to propose the following sequence events for the future of the TAE Hut. This future takes into account changing priorities that the Antarctic community is likely to have for the TAE Hut, and its changing value.

I suggest that the immediate future for the TAE hut be much as it is at present.

- It continues to be used recreationally by people at Scott Base, and continues to be developed as a museum of Kiwis in Antarctica.

- No major alterations would be undertaken to facilitate current use. It would not be used for long term or permanent occupation (working or living).

- Any reinstatement of historic features or conservation work would be undertaken in consultation with the AHT, due to their expertise in Antarctic conditions.

- The Hut continues to be managed by the TAE Hut Committee and run by Antarctica New Zealand, but the Committee considers including a representative from the AHT to facilitate dialogue between the organisations and ensure mutual understanding.

In the medium term I propose a change to the use of the Hut. This will reflect the fact that the future Antarctic community will have less direct connection with the Hut as a place of everyday use, and it will be older and 'more historical'. Scott Base will need to develop more recreational/retreat space in the rest of the Base to allow this to happen.

Changes in the transfer to this stage would be:

- The hut continues to be developed as a museum of Kiwis in Antarctica, but focuses particularly on the TAE and IGY period, and the establishment of Scott Base.
- The hut is no longer used for casual recreation by people at Scott Base, and becomes more of a historic museum.

- Photo albums begin to be transferred to Scott Base library or another suitable place on base (except originals), so that interaction with artefacts is decreased. The higher usage of these albums anticipated will be acceptable because photos are easily reproduced and replaced if damaged.

- Collection of specifically TAE and IGY memorabilia and artefacts increases. If possible, period items chosen for display will be replaced with items actually used in the Hut at that time.

- Potential sites for Vanda Station, Hallett Station and other post-IGY artefacts and memorabilia are identified. These would need to be reasonably accessible to the Antarctic community – the McMurdo Historical Museum is a possibility, though accessibility and control over the items and display would be crucial. If material were removed to New Zealand, the Antarctic community would need to be consulted over appropriate places to put stuff, particularly the Vanda collection.

- More AHT involvement with preservation.

In the long term I propose that the TAE Hut becomes a museum particularly focussed on the TAE and IGY period. This is contingent on appropriate places being found for display of more recent artefacts and memorabilia.

Changes in the transfer to this stage would be:

- Transfer of post-IGY artefacts to another location to allow sufficient space for the IGY and TAE stuff and to ensure the Hut is a reflection of what it was like back at the start.

- A Code of Conduct on appropriate behaviour in the Hut would be developed. As is the case with the heroic era huts now, anyone wishing to visit the Hut would need to be aware of this Code. This may involve locking the Hut, but would not involve restricting access, except perhaps by suggesting a maximum number of people in there at once.
- Potential transfer to the AHT for management, but under the auspices of a TAE Hut sub-Committee, or a modern history wing of the AHT. This would ensure that the particular values of the modern period are differentiated from the heroic era priorities.

- Maintenance and site planning to be discussed with Antarctica New Zealand. Antarctica New Zealand would need continued involvement in its management because of their responsibilities for the whole Scott Base site, and the need to ensure the TAE Hut works in harmony with the rest of the site. Antarctica New Zealand may hand over routine maintenance to the AHT, as it will be a more precious, and perhaps fragile, historic building.

- Consideration of an entry fee for the Hut, or inclusion with the current AHT package deal for the heroic era huts.

- Consideration of the appropriate name for the Hut – to reflect both the TAE and the IGY.

Policy

The TAE Hut Committee (or any other party that may be in charge of the future of the TAE Hut) should also consider recording or developing their policies on the following topics. This will assist those who are unclear about priorities for the Hut, and what it represents. It will also enable some continuity of approach, should membership of the Committee change. It is not envisaged that these policies would be static, but would be open to review.

Policies should include:

- The relationship between the AHT and the TAE Hut Committee. Responsibilities of each.

- Anticipated timetable for future events. This may be in terms of dates, or of deadlines such as replacement recreation space being constructed as Scott Base.

- Appropriate activities in the TAE Hut. For example – eating, use of furniture, wearing boots, large gatherings of people/parties, use for permanent purposes (e.g. office space).

- The time period that is being presented – what date? This applies particularly to the layout of the hut, but also to which artefacts it is appropriate to collect and display.
- The locations and people that are being presented. Are Vanda and Hallett Stations? Is it focussing on scientists, and base staff?

- What maintenance is appropriate, and what is considered natural deterioration, and allowed to happen.

- The collection and display of artefacts – what sort of items are appropriate, and what kind of display is appropriate?

- How should items and features in the Hut be explained? Should they be labelled? A brochure created? A tour guide?

- What is the ideal relationship between the TAE Hut and the rest of Scott Base? Visually and operationally.

- The place of tourist visits. Should tourists or other visitors be charged?
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